

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****AUG 02 2007**REMARKS

Applicant has amended the Claims 1, 4, 8 and 11 and cancelled Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 12 without prejudice. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment is supported by the application as originally filed and does not contain any new matter (see paragraph [[0055]] in the publication of this application). Therefore, the Office Action will be discussed in terms of the claims as amended

The Examiner has rejected the Claims 4 and 7-10 under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Foodman et al. stating that Foodman et al. discloses every element of the Applicant's invention as claimed.

Applicant has carefully reviewed Foodman et al. and respectfully submits that Foodman et al. is directed towards a security system and teaches that the status of a sensor and an observation camera is always observed and information thereof is sent to a website. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Foodman et al. does not show or suggest that attribute information on the living facilities would be sent to the server.

In contrast to Foodman et al., Applicant's invention is directed towards a dwelling management server which observes the attribute information comprised of the inherent information and the status information on communication equipment such as a television or a radio, electric home appliances such as washing machines, living accommodations such as the air conditioner and lighting equipment, office appliances or plant facilities in a factory and sends this information to the service server. In Applicant's invention the service server sends back the introduction information on products or services selected from the information prepared in advance as visual display information in reply to the received attribute information. For example, Applicant's invention provides to a user a notice of a new product or a notice such as a requirement for maintenance service on the household equipment depending on the product information and the usage status of the household equipment provided in the house. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's invention is not a security system. In other words, Foodman et al. merely observes the status of a sensor and the video signal from a camera and does not observe the attribute information comprised of the inherent information and the status information on communication equipment, electrical home appliances, living accommodations, office e appliances and/or plant facilities, as does Applicant's invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Foodman et al. does not disclose each and

every element of Applicant's invention and is patentably distinct therefrom. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 4 and 7-10 are not anticipated by Foodman et al.

Examiners further rejected the Claims 1, 11 and 13 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Foodman et al. in view of Blackee et al. stating that Foodman et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention except for the introduction information on products and services; Blackee teaches introduction information on products and services; and it would have been obvious to modify Foodman et al. in view of the teachings of Blackee et al.

In reply thereto, Applicant would like to incorporate by reference his comments above concerning Applicant's invention and Foodman et al. made above. In addition, applicant would like to incorporate by reference Applicant's remarks concerning Foodman et al. submitted in Applicant's amendment filed February 15, 2007.

In addition, Applicant has carefully reviewed Blackee et al. and respectfully submits that Blackee et al. relates to system for enhancing the communication between a utility such as an electric company with its customers and nothing more. In particular, Blackee et al. merely teaches cross-marketing and does not show or suggest that one would present products and services to a customer in response to some sense condition at the customers dwelling, whether the dwelling is a house or an office. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art of internet-based security, fire and emergency identification such as in Foodman et al. would not look to the teachings of Blackee et al. which merely relate to customer service between an electrical utility and its customers.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that not only is the combination suggested by the Examiner not Applicant's invention but also the combination suggested by the Examiner would not be made by one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Claims 1, 11 and 13 are not obvious over Foodman et al. in view of Blackee et al.

In view of the above, therefore, it is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered, favorably considered and the case passed to issue.